

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP  
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

1 BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)  
bsimon@pswlaw.com  
2 BENJAMIN E. SHIFTAN (Bar No. 265767)  
bshiftan@pswlaw.com  
3 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450  
4 San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-9000  
5 Facsimile: (415) 433-9008  
  
6 CHRISTOPHER B. DOLAN (Bar No. 165358)  
chris@cbdllaw.com  
7 **THE DOLAN LAW FIRM**  
1438 Market Street  
8 San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 421-2800  
9 Facsimile: (415) 421-2830

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab  
Co.; Administrative Services SD, LLC dba  
14 Yellow Radio Service; All Yellow Taxi, Inc.  
dba Metro Cab; American Cab, LLC;  
15 American Cab, LLC dba Pomona Valley  
Yellow Cab; Bell Cab Company, Inc.; TM-  
16 MTM, Inc.; Big Dog City Corporation dba  
Citywide Dispatch, Citywide Taxi, and Big  
17 Dog Cab; Cabco Yellow, Inc. dba California  
Yellow Cab; C&J Leasing, Inc. dba Royal  
18 Taxi; G&S Transit Management, Inc.; Gorgee  
Enterprises, Inc.; LA City Cab, LLC; Long  
19 Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.;  
Network Paratransit Systems, Inc.; South Bay  
20 Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab;  
Taxi Leasing, Inc. dba Yellow Cab of Ventura  
21 County; Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc.;  
Tri Counties Transit Corporation dba Blue  
22 Dolphin Cab of Santa Barbara, Yellow Cab of  
Santa Maria, and Yellow Cab of San Luis  
23 Obispo; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-  
operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab,

24 Plaintiffs,  
25 vs.

26 Uber Technologies, Inc.; Rasier, LLC; and  
27 Rasier-CA, LLC,

28 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:15-cv-01257-JST

**PLAINTIFFS L.A. TAXI COOPERATIVE,  
INC. DBA YELLOW CAB CO.; LONG  
BEACH YELLOW CAB CO-OPERATIVE,  
INC.; SOUTH BAY CO-OPERATIVE INC.  
DBA UNITED CHECKER CAB; AND  
YELLOW CAB OF SOUTH BAY CO-  
OPERATIVE, INC. DBA SOUTH BAY  
YELLOW CAB'S REPONSES TO  
DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES,  
INC.'S SECOND SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES**

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

2 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS L.A. TAXI COOPERATIVE, INC. DBA YELLOW  
3 CAB CO.; LONG BEACH YELLOW CAB CO-OPERATIVE,  
4 INC.; SOUTH BAY CO-OPERATIVE, INC. DBA UNITED  
CHECKER CAB; AND YELLOW CAB OF SOUTH BAY CO-  
OPERATIVE, INC. DBA SOUTH BAY YELLOW CAB

5 SET NO.: TWO

6 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

7 All answers contained herein are based only upon such information and documents  
8 presently available and specifically known to Plaintiffs L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow  
9 Cab Co.; Long Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.; South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba United  
10 Checker Cab; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab  
11 (“Plaintiffs”). In addition, further independent discovery, independent investigation, legal  
12 research and/or analysis may supply additional facts and/or add meaning to the known facts. The  
13 responses hereinafter set forth are given without prejudice to Plaintiffs’ right at trial to produce  
14 evidence of any subsequently discovered fact or facts that may later develop.

15 **II. GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

16 Plaintiffs object generally to the Interrogatories on the following grounds, each of which is  
17 incorporated by reference in the responses to the individual Interrogatories below. All responses  
18 set forth herein are subject to and without waiver of any of these General Objections:

19 1. Plaintiffs object to each interrogatory, instruction or definition that purports to  
20 impose obligations on Plaintiffs greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil  
21 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

22 2. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are compound,  
23 conjunctive, or disjunctive.

24 3. Plaintiffs object to each Interrogatory, instruction or definition to the extent that it  
25 calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work  
26 product doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged or protected from discovery.

27 4. Plaintiffs object to each Interrogatory to the extent that it fails to state with  
28 sufficient particularity the information and categories of information to be provided.

1           5.       Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to require Plaintiffs to  
2 produce all information that supports or otherwise relates to specific contentions in this litigation,  
3 on the grounds that such contention interrogatories are unduly burdensome and premature at this  
4 stage of the litigation.

5           6.       Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, as well as the definitions and instructions, to  
6 the extent the information requested is not relevant to a party's claim or defense and/or is not  
7 proportional to the needs of the case.

8           7.       Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they, or any portion of  
9 them, seek information within the possession, custody, or control of any Defendant, or of publicly  
10 available information such that the information is obtainable from some other source that is more  
11 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, or the production of the information will impose  
12 undue burden, inconvenience, or expense upon Plaintiffs.

13          8.       In responding to these Interrogatories, Plaintiffs do not in any way waive or intend  
14 to waive any privilege or objection, but rather intend to preserve and are preserving the following:

15           a) all objections as to the relevancy, materiality, and admissibility of any information  
16 sought by any Interrogatory;

17           b) all objections as to vagueness, ambiguity or other infirmity in the form of the  
18 Interrogatories and any objections based on the undue burden imposed by the Interrogatories and  
19 each individual Interrogatory contained therein;

20           c) all rights to object on any grounds to the use of any of the responses, or their subject  
21 matter, in any subsequent proceedings, including the trial of this or any other action;

22           d) all rights to object on any grounds to any further Interrogatories or other discovery  
23 requests involving or related to the subject matter of the Interrogatories;

24           e) the right to supplement responses to the Interrogatories prior to trial; and

25           f) any and all privileges and/or rights under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or other  
26 statutes, guidelines or case law.

### 27 **III. OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS**

28          1.       Plaintiffs object to the definition of the term "STATE THE BASIS" as overly broad

1 and burdensome. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that this definition calls for privileged  
 2 and/or protected information. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the extent that this definition seeks  
 3 information outside of Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiffs' responses to the  
 4 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 5 information in the sole possession of Plaintiffs' counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 6 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it  
 7 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 8 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

9       2. Plaintiffs object to the definition of "COMMUNICATION" as overly broad and  
 10 burdensome. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
 11 protected information. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the extent that this definition seeks  
 12 information outside of Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiffs' responses to the  
 13 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 14 information in the sole possession of Plaintiffs' counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 15 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it  
 16 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 17 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

18       3. Plaintiffs object to the definition of "DOCUMENT" as overly broad and  
 19 burdensome. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
 20 protected information. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the extent that this definition seeks  
 21 information outside of Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiffs' responses to the  
 22 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 23 information in the sole possession of Plaintiffs' counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 24 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it  
 25 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 26 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

27       4. Plaintiffs object to the definition of the terms "YOU" and "YOUR" as overly broad  
 28 and burdensome. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that this definition calls for privileged

1 and/or protected information. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the extent that this definition seeks  
 2 information outside of Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiffs' responses to the  
 3 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 4 information in the sole possession of Plaintiffs' counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 5 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it  
 6 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 7 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

8         5. Plaintiffs object to the definition of the term "RELATING TO" as overly broad and  
 9 burdensome. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
 10 protected information. In addition, Plaintiffs object to the extent that this definition seeks  
 11 information outside of Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiffs' responses to the  
 12 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiffs' possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 13 information in the sole possession of Plaintiffs' counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 14 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiffs further object to this definition to the extent that it  
 15 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 16 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

## 17                     **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES, SET TWO**

### 18             **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

19             Please precisely identify the geographic area where YOU offer taxi cab services, and if that  
 20 area has changed from March 2009 to present, please specifically identify the changes.

### 21             **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

22             Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the Preliminary Statement, General Objections, and  
 23 Objections to Definitions set forth above. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that the  
 24 information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product  
 25 doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged and/or protected from discovery. Plaintiffs further object  
 26 to the extent the information is publically available and, thus, equally available to the Defendants.  
 27 Plaintiffs further object to the phrases "precisely," "specifically," and "the geographic area where  
 28 YOU offer taxi cab services" as vague and ambiguous. The use of the terms "precisely" and

1 “specifically” renders this request unduly burdensome. Plaintiffs will respond with the specificity  
 2 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing  
 3 orders, and orders of this Court.

4 Subject to and without waiving all general and specific objections, Plaintiffs respond as  
 5 follows:

6 Plaintiff L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab Co. provides taxi cab services in the  
 7 City of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, Inglewood, Venice Beach, Westwood, Bel  
 8 Air, Brentwood, Calabasas, Century City, Hollywood, San Fernando, Pacific Palisades, Topanga  
 9 and Marina Del Rey.

10 Plaintiff Long Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc. provides taxi cab services in  
 11 Bellflower, Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, Lakewood, Long Beach, Los Alamitos, Seal Beach and  
 12 Signal Hill.

13 Plaintiff South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab provides taxi cab services  
 14 in Carson, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, El Segundo, Lawndale, Rolling Hills, East Rancho  
 15 Dominquez, Lomita, Rolling Hills Estates, Gardena, Manhattan Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, and  
 16 Palos Verdes Estates.

17 Plaintiff Yellow Cab of South Bay Cooperative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab provides  
 18 taxi cab services in Carson, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, El Segundo, Lawndale, Rolling  
 19 Hills, East Rancho Dominquez, Lomita, Rolling Hills Estates, Gardena, Manhattan Beach,  
 20 Torrance, Hawthorne, and Palos Verdes Estates.

21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP  
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

1 December 7, 2015

/s/ Benjamin E. Shiftan

BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)

bsimon@pswlaw.com

BENJAMIN E. SHIFTAN (Bar No. 265767)

bshiftan@pswlaw.com

**PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450

San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 433-9000

Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

CHRISTOPHER B. DOLAN (Bar No. 165358)

chris@cbdlaw.com

**THE DOLAN LAW FIRM**

1438 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94102

Telephone: (415) 421-2800

Facsimile: (415) 421-2830

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

28



**VERIFICATION**

I, William Rouse, declare:

I hereby state that I am General Manager for L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab Co.; Long Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.; South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab. I am authorized to make this verification on behalf of L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab Co.; Long Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.; South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab in this action.

I have read the foregoing PLAINTIFFS L.A. TAXI COOPERATIVE, INC. DBA YELLOW CAB CO.; LONG BEACH YELLOW CAB CO-OPERATIVE, INC.; SOUTH BAY CO-OPERATIVE INC. DBA UNITED CHECKER CAB; AND YELLOW CAB OF SOUTH BAY CO-OPERATIVE, INC. DBA SOUTH BAY YELLOW CAB'S REPONSES TO DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES and hereby declare that the responses are true to and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief, with the exception of those matters upon which I have relied on the investigation of counsel, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. I reserve my right to supplement or revise this statement based upon any subsequently discovered documents or information.

Executed at Sacramento, CA on December 7, 2015.

  
William Rouse